REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 19, 2010 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants also thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the telephonic interview conducted on April 21, 2010. The amendments and remarks presented in this Response are consistent with discussions during the interview. Thus, this Response also constitutes a statement of the substance of the interview.

By this Response, claims 9 and 30 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the claims amendments can be found in the specification, for example, paragraphs [0059]-[0060], [0084]-[0086] and [0091]. Claims 1, 8-9, 11-12, 15-27, and 29-30 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to page 2, paragraphs 3-4 of the Office Action in which claims 1 and 8 are now considered withdrawn from consideration. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the decision to withdraw claims 1 and 8 from consideration. Applicants submit the claim amendments that were made to claim 1 incorporate subject matter that had been previously recited in dependent claim 3. No previous species or restriction requirements have been made. Further, Applicant submits that the subject matter of claim 1 and now cancelled dependent claim 3 has been searched by the Examiner, and thus would present no additional burden on the Examiner to continue to include in the pending claim set. Thus, reconsideration of the decision to withdraw claims 1 and 8 from consideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 9, 11-12, 15-27 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cairns et al. ("Cairns1") (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0030653) in view of Cairns et al. ("Cairns2")(U.S. Patent No. 6,268,841), Enami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,493), Morita (U.S. Patent No. 6,989,810) and Nitta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,661,402). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants respect traverse the rejection because Cairns1, Cairns2, Enami, Morita and Nitta, analyzed alone or in any combination, fail to teach the combined features recited in the

claims of the present application. In particular, Cairns1, Cairns2, Enami, Morita and Nitta fail to teach or suggest a data driving apparatus for a liquid crystal display device that includes among other features, "a discharging part connected between output buffers and the data lines and simultaneously outputting the pixel signals held in the holding part for the first horizontal period to corresponding data lines for an enable period of a source output enable signal and outputting a common voltage Vcom to the corresponding data lines for a disable period of the source output enable signal... wherein the common voltage Vcom is the voltage for driving a liquid crystal cell", as recited in independent claim 9 of the present application.

Cairns1, Cairns2, Enami, Morita and Nitta also fail to teach or suggest a data driving method for a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, "simultaneously outputting the held pixel signals to corresponding data lines for an enable period of an input source output enable signal of a second horizontal period and outputting a common voltage Vcom to the corresponding data lines for a disable period of the input source output enable signal of the second horizontal period... wherein the common voltage Vcom is the voltage for driving a liquid crystal cell", as recited in independent claim 30 of the present application.

As discussed during the interview, the current Office Action fails to address the above recited features of the present application. More particularly, the Office Action appears to rely on Morita to teach "the concept of supplying signals separately during each half of a horizontal period, and that the signals are controlled by an ODD/EVEN signal" (see Page 3, paragraph 6 of the Office Action). However, the common voltage Vcom, as recited in the claims of the present application is not addressed or taught by the cited references including Morita. Applicants submit the Office Action fails to address how Cairns1, Cairns2, Enami, Morita and Nitta teach the structure of the data driving apparatus, as recited in independent claim 9, having "a discharging part connected between output buffers and the data lines and simultaneously outputting the pixel signals held in the holding part for the first horizontal period to corresponding data lines for an enable period of a source output enable signal and outputting a common voltage Vcom to the corresponding data lines for a disable period of the source output enable signal... wherein the common voltage Vcom is the voltage for driving a liquid crystal cell."

The Office Action further fails to address how Cairns1, Cairns2, Enami, Morita and Nitta teach a data driving method, as recited in independent claim 30, that includes "simultaneously outputting the held pixel signals to corresponding data lines for an enable period of an input source output enable signal of a second horizontal period and outputting a common voltage Vcom to the corresponding data lines for a disable period of the input source output enable signal of the second horizontal period... wherein the common voltage Vcom is the voltage for driving a liquid crystal cell".

Based upon discussions with the Examiner during the telephonic interview and the amendments to independent claims 9 and 30, Applicants respectfully submit that because Cairns1, Cairns2, Enami, Morita and Nitta fail to teach or suggest the above features of independent claims 9 and 30, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented. As such, independent claim 9 and its dependent claims 11-12, 15-27 and 29, and independent claim 30 are allowable over any combination of Cairns1, Cairns2, Enami, Morita and Nitta. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: May 17, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Valerie P. Hayes/

Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant